

REMARKS

Summary Of The Office Action

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11 are pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa et al., (USP 6,353,460) and further in view of Hwang (USP 5,896,177).

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 6-9 and 11.

Claims 3 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 3 is rewritten in independent form, and is believed to be allowable.

Analysis of the Art Rejections

Claim 1

Claims 1 stands rejected as unpatentable under § 103(a) over Sokawa in view of Hwang.

Amended claim 1 recites “a switching portion for selecting either the first clock frequency from the first phase locked loop or the second clock frequency from the second phase locked loop according to a predetermined control signal.” In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner recognizes that Hwang does not disclose the first and second phase locked loops, or the switching portion. The Examiner, however, relies on Hwang for this disclosure. Hwang does not disclose the switching portion as described in the present application. In applying the disclosure of Hwang to the claim, the Examiner states when “the switch 66 selectively outputs a signal to the PLL circuit 70 according to the control signal, PLL 70, as a result, generates at least two different clock frequency signals.” This is an entirely different concept from the switch of the present disclosure.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APP. NO. 09/472,869

For example, the switch of the present disclosure selects an output of either the first phase locked loop or the second phase locked loop whenever the Hwang apparatus changes the output of PLL 70 based upon a signal received from switch 66. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the Sokawa and Hwang does not teach or suggest the switching portion of proposed amended claim 1, and at least for this reason these references do not render the combination defined by claim 1 obvious.

Claim 2

Claim 2, depending on claim 1, is patentable for at least the same reason stated above for the amended claim 1.

Also, the present Amendment corrects an error in the original application. That is, the present Amendment corrects the frequency “29.94 Hz to “29.97 Hz” and the frequency “74.175 MHz” to “74.176 MHz.” The changes are made to correct obvious typographical errors and do not introduce any new matter into the specification. The ATSC standard supports 18 image formats based on official frame rates (Group 1, frame rates) of 60 Hz, 30 Hz, and 24Hz. The ATSC standard also supports 36 image formats considering NTSC frame rates (Group 2 frame rates) such as 59.94 Hz, 29.97 Hz, and 23.976 Hz. The sampling rate needed to support the image format based on the official frame rates (Group 1 rates) is 74.25 MHz, while the sampling rate needed to support the image format based on the NTSC frame rates (Group 2 frame rates) is 76.176 MHz. Thus, since “clock 1” in Fig. 2 is 74.25 MHz and used for the Group 1 frame rate and “clock 2” is 74.176 MHz and used for the Group 2 frame rate, the sampling rate can be selectively used according to whether video data support either the image format based on the official frame rate of

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APP. NO. 09/472,869

the ATSC standard or the image format based on the frame rate of the NTSC standard. Therefore, a digital television can be easily operated in conjunction with the NTSC apparatuses.

Also, with regard to claim 2, the Examiner states that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to generate a clock frequency of 74.25 MHz and 74.175 MHz for PLL 1 and 2 and that the frequencies do not serve any particular purpose. However, as explained above, there is a particular purpose served by the particular frequencies recited.

Claims 3 and 4

Claims 3 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner states they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 is rewritten in independent form to avoid introducing additional limitations into the allowable claim.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APP. NO. 09/472,869

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter A. McKenna
Registration No. 38,551

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 7, 2005